

Subj: **Re: Embarrassment**
Date: 02/15/2006 2:39:37 P.M. Central Standard Time
From: [PLMossman](#)
To: [EricNumis](#)

In a message dated 2/12/2006 4:13:05 P.M. Eastern Standard Time, EricNumis writes:

Dear Phil:

The so called new discovery I sent you as to Jefferson's attempt to value Virginia coppers at one penny Virginia exchange was almost as dumb as a Bush opinion. I was told it was new and I believed it until I looked up my own 1962 article and found it detailed there. I am sorry to have bothered you with it as you probably knew i was wrong and as a matter of courtesy did not want to tell me. Eric

Dear Eric:

Please excuse the delay in reply but I've literally been burning the mid-night oil on my counterfeit article. If you mean by your 1962 article the Museum Notes supplement to the Virginia article, I could not find anything in there about it, nor in the original Virginia NN&M series. It there another 1962 reference?

As far as the .jpg you sent me, it was too light to read but my wife is going to darken it for me. She is good at that sort of thing - I'm all thumbs.

I'll be back to you.

Phil

PS - Give Bush some credit - at least he isn't dumb enough to go bird hunting with Cheney.

Subj: **Finally!**
Date: 04/07/2006 3:26:51 P.M. Central Daylight Time
From: [PLMossman](#)
To: [EricNumis](#)

Dear Eric:

Please excuse the great delay in my getting back to you after having received the Introduction by David R. Johnson. It had some interesting, new information for me.

Johnson mentioned [p. xvi] that citizens generally had to bear the costs of prosecuting counterfeiters. I then recalled that in Bowen's *Rhode Island* book [p. 7] that the Jewells had to foot the cost of the prosecution of Mr. Fenton who was accused of altering the bills they were stuck with. Since he was not convicted, the Jewells had to pay the court costs! This was new to me but I found other references to this unfair practice.

He also said [p. xv] that each colony was responsible for its own currency and there was little intercolonial cooperation. I disagree with that since several colonies had reciprocal arrangements and made the counterfeiting and passing of the notes of neighboring colonies a crime in their individual jurisdictions.

This is an excerpt of my findings on the subject on this reciprocity [not complete]:

New Hampshire: in 1711 made the conviction of counterfeiting or altering paper money of any New England colony, or knowingly to pass same, punishable by cropped ears in the pillory.

Rhode Island: in 1710: unlawful to counterfeit, alter, or utter bills of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

Connecticut: in 1711 made counterfeiting bills punished by damages, 6 months in jail, whatever corporal punishment court might decide; applicable to notes of Mass, NH, RI, NY, and NJ also.

Maryland: 1754: counterfeiting bills punished by damages, 6 months in jail, whatever corporal punishment court might decide, applicable also to bills of Mass, NH, RI, NY, and NJ. Later extended to Virginia.

I had already used the point about counterfeiting being the oldest, or almost oldest profession. I liked his analysis of how counterfeiting attacked the very lifeblood of the economy. He did a very good job in my opinion.

In an earlier email, I gave you a list of the provincial emissions that were recalled because of extensive counterfeiting. I found another:

The 1723 and 1725-26 Pennsylvania issues were so successfully counterfeited by skilled European artisans that "within four years after their first emission it was found necessary to call in the whole lot,

as it was not possible to discern between the good and bad notes," but not before £6,000 in forged bills, imported from England, had been successfully passed. [Scott - *Counterfeiting in Pennsylvania*, p. 52]
[This passage is from my paper.]

Two more questions: can I send you a copy of this 60-page opus to read, correct, comment upon or use to start your fireplace? If that is a problem, what I really need you to censor is the section on paper money.

And - is the Eric P. Newman Numismatic Education Society in the position to provide Xeroxes of any of these notes for illustrations? I know you are very busy with multiple projects and was hesitating to ask. I can see what the ANS has. I've never asked them so I don't know.

I hope all is well with you and yours. Spring arrived in Maine until the snow came again!

Best regards,
Phil

Subj: Re: Entry in 5th edition under Mass 1722. Please review and suggest Eric
 Date: 12/7/2006 5:02:59 PM Central Standard Time
 From: PLMossman
 To: EricNumis

In a message dated 12/7/2006 3:28:36 P.M. Eastern Standard Time, EricNumis writes:

The 1722 small change parchment issue of Massachusetts Bay Colony was not authorized to prevent or compete with William Wood's 1722 - 1724 Rosa Americana mixed metal coinage for the American colonies but was the result of a severe small change shortage in Massachusetts Bay Colony. However that shortage condition may have been influential in Wood's desire to seek a patent from England to produce such coinage but no such evidence has been located. These conclusions seem confirmed by the following:

In April 1722 **Governor** Samuel Shute of Massachusetts Bay Colony by Proclamation **forbade** the wilful tearing or cutting of **Massachusetts** paper bills to make small change and **prohibited** officials from accepting it (*Boston Newsletter*, April 16, 1722). The Massachusetts Bay small change parchment notes dated June 1722 were officially approved by a May 30, 1722 Act. *The Boston Gazette* (a Benjamin Franklin newspaper) of September 17, 1722, published a notice from London dated July 21, 1722, that William Wood had received a patent for mixed metal coinage (Rosa Americana) for the American colonies in addition to the right to make a copper coinage for Ireland. The *Boston Newsletter* of October 3, 1723, published a notice that on January 17, 1723, William Wood had just begun coining copper coinage for Ireland and would begin coining Rosa Americana pieces in Bristol, England, in a month. *The Boston Gazette* of December 16, 1723, reported that the House of Commons in Dublin had declared the Wood's Irish coinage was a fraud.

Dear Eric:

I had not previously read all the newspaper quotations you cite but I think you are absolutely correct. As further evidence, I also base my opinion on my hero Joseph Felt who succinctly stated [p. 78]:

"1722. June 26. While the paper money was multiplied, small coin as well as large, was exceedingly rare. For this reason, an emission of £500 worth of 1d, 2d, and 3d bills is ordered"

(This is from the Mass. Provincial Records)

To me, this tells why the parchment emission was approved. It was a strictly local problem and not an attempt to sabotage Wood's patent. As you say, Wood may have use this chronic shortage as an excuse or motive for his Rosas, but the reverse is NOT true. The parchment pieces were not created to compete with him but rather filled a long-standing need. Note that large coins were also in short supply.

As for your paragraph, it is fine and to the point. I did do some minor editing; commas after the year except when the date is used as an adjective; italics for the newspapers; and a few typos. I changed "forbade" and "prohibited" to the past.

Something else just dawned on me: these parchment bills were for Massachusetts [or essentially NE] only and what few Rosas reached these shores circulated everywhere - PEI, NY, CT and Williamsburg. Why would Massachusetts go to such great pains to

control Wood's money in any other colony? They didn't care what circulated in Anglican Virginia! Also, if Massachusetts was concerned about the low intrinsic value of Wood's money, a governor's proclamation or an act of the General Court could have set its own value on them since they were not legal tender. Several places in the patent [Crosby] it says ".. who will voluntarily accept the same ..." I think that Crosby just put the parchments and the Rosas in the same chapter since they were contemporaneous - and not a cause and effect situation. At the bottom of p. 165, onto the top of 166, I read that Crosby is very noncommittal "as to the reception of Wood's coinage in America."

It is time for me to get off my soap box.

I'm very glad you are adding this to your 5th edition. Hope this is OK.

Regards,
Phil

Full detail is here

Subj: Entry in 5th edition under Mass 1722. Please review and suggest Eric
 Date: 12/7/2006 2:28:36 PM Central Standard Time
 From: Eric Numis
 To: PL Wessman

The 1722 small change ~~parchment issues~~ of Massachusetts Bay Colony was not authorized to prevent or compete with William Wood's 1722 - 1724 Rosa Americana mixed metal coinage for the American colonies but was the result of a severe small change shortage in Massachusetts Bay Colony. However that shortage condition may have been influential in Wood's desire to seek a patent from England to produce such coinage but no such evidence has been located. These conclusions seem confirmed by the following:

In April 1722 Governor ^{ade} Samuel Shute of Massachusetts Bay Colony by Proclamation forbade the wilful tearing or cutting of Massachusetts paper bills to make small change and prohibiting officials from accepting ^{them} it (Boston Newsletter, April 16, 1722). The Massachusetts Bay small change parchment notes dated June 1722 were officially approved by a May 30, 1722 Act. The Boston Gazette (a Benjamin Franklin newspaper) of September 17, 1722, published a notice from London dated July 21, 1722, that William Wood had received a patent for mixed metal coinage (Rosa Americana) for the American colonies in addition to the right to make a copper coinage for Ireland. The Boston Newsletter of October 3, 1723 published a notice that on January 17, 1723, William Wood had just begun ^{minting} ~~coining~~ copper coinage for Ireland and would begin coining Rosa Americana pieces in Bristol, England in a month. The Boston Gazette of December 16, 1723, reported that the House of Commons in Dublin had declared the Wood's Irish coinage was a fraud.

underlining is for italics

Subject: **Congratulations!**
Date: 9/29/2008 9:59:49 AM Central Daylight Time
From: [PLMossman](#)
To: [EricNumis](#)

Congratulations Eric!!!

I read in today's E-Sylum that your fifth child was just delivered! That must be a load off your mind after so many months of labor pains!

Best regard,

Phil

Looking for simple solutions to your real-life financial challenges? [Check out WalletPop for the latest news and information, tips and calculators.](#)

Subj: **Thank you!**
Date: 11/10/2008 12:56:48 PM Central Standard Time
From: [PLMossman](#)
To: [EricNumis](#)

memo

Dear Eric:

Just a quick note to tell you that the package arrived! Thanks so much. It is gorgeous. The court transcript is fascinating. A letter follows.

Best regards,

Phil

PS - C4 happens this weekend; I'll go down on Friday.

P.

AOL Search: Your one stop for directions, recipes and all other Holiday needs. [Search Now.](#)

11/11/08

Dear Eric:

No matter what you might think, this is not a St. Louis Cardinal - but rather a Maine cardinal [♀] perched in a friend's garden getting ready for winter.


I can't thank you enough for your new edition and the undeserved acknowledgment in the Preface - all I did was to learn! Thanks so much.

Poor Mr. James Ward and his fake £ 3! I found the Stack's 2004 reference in your book and it was an obvious sloppy job of counterfeiting - especially the "passed October 12, MDCCLVIII" line. Was there any endorsement on the back of the bill? You may

have seen how Jordan's article in the latest CNL re: North Carolina bills. I assume this was a grand jury indictment. Although a few words are hidden by the bill, I could figure out what was said by referring to similar indictments printed in Colonial Records of North Carolina from the Internet.

I found Judge Maurice Moore and his CV, but Messrs Ward and George Admire were not listed.

I'm back to work on my Counterfeit opus - adding ^{a few} more facts I've accumulated over the summer. Again my thanks - and kindest regards to you and Evelyn.

Sincerely,


From The Gardens of
All Souls Congregational Church
United Church of Christ
Bangor, Maine

